

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/273,230	03/18/1999	JEFFREY L. CLELAND	P0998D1	6833
7	1590 09/12/2005		EXAM	INER
WENDY M LEE			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H	
GENENTECH INC 1 DNA WAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 940804990			1643	
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

$\mathcal{Y}(\underline{\hspace{0.5cm}})$					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Antion Commence	09/273,230	CLELAND ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher H. Yaen	1643			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 J	une 2005.				
	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 42,44-47,51 and 52 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 42,44-47,51 and 52 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	a 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/10/05. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Application/Control Number: 09/273,230 Page 2

Art Unit: 1643

DETAILED ACTION

Re: Cleland et al

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/22/05 has been entered.

- 2. Accordingly, claims 1-41,43, and 48-50 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 51-52 are newly added.
- 3. Claims 42,44-47 and 51-52 are pending and examined on the merits.
- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The Information Disclosure Statement filed 1/10/2005 is acknowledged and considered. A signed copy of the IDS is attached hereto.

Claim Rejections Maintained - 35 USC § 103

6. The rejection of claims 42,44-47, and now newly added claims 51-52 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Hudziak *et al* (US Patent 5,770,195) in view of

Art Unit: 1643

Hudziak *et al* (US Patent 5,720,954) and Burton *et al* (Am J. Vet Res. 1981 Feb; 42(20):308-310) is maintained for the reasons of record. Applicant argues that the instant invention is not obvious over the cited prior art. Specifically, applicant indicates that the amendment of the claims to recite "subcutaneous" administration and "80 mg" both render the claims nonobviousness. With regard to the routes of administration, applicant argues that SQ administration would not be considered an optimization of IV administration. Applicant further contends that the range taught in the prior art would not be obvious given the teaching of the prior art. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive to overcome the rejection of record.

If a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established, the burden shifts to the applicant to come forward with arguments and/or evidence to rebut the prima facie case. See, e.g., Dillon, 919 F.2d at 692, 16 USPQ2d at 1901. Rebuttal evidence and arguments can be presented in the specification, In re Soni, 54 F.3d 746, 750, 34 USPQ2d 1684, 1687 (Fed. Cir. 1995), by counsel, In re Chu, 66 F.3d 292, 299, 36 USPQ2d 1089, 1094-95 (Fed. Cir. 1995), or by way of an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, e.g., Soni, 54 F.3d at 750, 34 USPQ2d at 1687; In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1474, 223 USPQ 785, 789-90 (Fed. Cir. 1984). However, arguments of counsel cannot take the place of factually supported objective evidence. See, e.g., In re Huang, 100 F.3d 135, 139-40, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1996); In re De Blauwe, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In the instant case, applicant simply rebuts the *prima facie* case by indicating that SQ administration would not be an optimization of IV administration set forth in the prior office action. Applicant has not set

forth any objective evidence to indicate that SQ administration is not obvious over IV administration.

Moreover, applicants can rebut a prima facie case of obviousness based on overlapping ranges by showing the criticality of the claimed range. "The law is replete with cases in which the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is some range or other variable within the claims. . . . In such a situation, the applicant must show that the particular range is critical, generally by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range." In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In the instant case, the claims as interpreted based on the recitation of the term "about", opens the range of the dosage to any range. Moreover, applicant has failed to provided any indication that the specifically recited ranges are critical to the invention.

Therefore, the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious is maintained for the reasons of record.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE**FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued

Application/Control Number: 09/273,230

Art Unit: 1643

examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H. Yaen whose telephone number is 571-272-0838. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/273,230 Page 6

Art Unit: 1643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher Yaen Art Unit 1643 September 1, 2005 SHEELA HUFF PRIMARY EXAMINER